

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please amend claims 2-4 to read as follows:

A7

2. (Amended) The plasma display panel according to claim 1, wherein said scanning electrode comprises a ladder-shape electrode extending in the first direction provided in a center part thereof in the second direction.

3. (Amended) The plasma display panel according to claim 1, wherein said scanning electrode includes a portion protruding in the first direction in a center part thereof in the second direction.

4. (Amended) The plasma display panel according to claim 1, wherein a dimension of said scanning electrode in the first direction increases as it approaches said sustaining electrode.

**REMARKS**

The specification and claims 2-4 have been amended to correct minor clerical errors and to employ more idiomatic English. No new matter has been entered. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121, marked copies of the amended specification paragraphs and amended claims showing the changes made therein accompany this Amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Namiki et al. (US Patent No. 6,157,128) is improper. Claim 1 requires that the area of the scanning electrode Y is smaller than the area of the sustaining electrode X. The smaller area allows brighter light emissions discharge compared to the prior art. The Examiner claims that FIGS. 1 and 5 in Namiki et al. teach this configuration. To the contrary, FIG. 5 clearly teaches the opposite. In FIG. 5, the teeth of the scanning electrode Y are larger than the sustaining electrode X and thus the area is larger (col. 6, lines 21-23 and 27-29). This allows, according to Namiki et al., an

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.  
130 W. CUSHING ST.  
TUCSON, AZ 85701  
TEL. 520.882.7623  
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET  
MANCHESTER, NH 03101  
TEL. 603.668.1400  
FAX. 603.668.8567